

From wang!elf.wang.com!ucsd.edu!packet-radio-relay Sun Feb 17 18:17:50 1991 remote  
from tosspot  
Received: by tosspot (1.63/waf)  
via UUCP; Sun, 17 Feb 91 18:06:14 EST  
for lee  
Received: from somewhere by elf.wang.com  
id aa15669; Sun, 17 Feb 91 18:17:48 GMT  
Received: from ucsd.edu by uunet.UU.NET (5.61/1.14) with SMTP  
id AA28682; Sun, 17 Feb 91 08:44:24 -0500  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA09612  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Sun, 17 Feb 91 04:30:12 -0800 for hpbbrd!db0sao!dg4scv  
Received: by ucsd.edu; id AA09602  
sendmail 5.64/UCSD-2.1-sun  
Sun, 17 Feb 91 04:30:09 -0800 for /usr/lib/sendmail -oc -odb -oQ/var/spool/  
lqueue -oi -fpacket-radio-relay packet-radio-list  
Message-Id: <9102171230.AA09602@ucsd.edu>  
Date: Sun, 17 Feb 91 04:30:06 PST  
From: Packet-Radio Mailing List and Newsgroup </dev/null@ucsd.edu>  
Reply-To: Packet-Radio@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Packet-Radio Digest V91 #46  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

Packet-Radio Digest                      Sun, 17 Feb 91                      Volume 91 : Issue 46

Today's Topics:

                    'To:' field anarchy! (2 msgs)  
Has Part 97 changed THAT much? (was Re: PACKET->Internet Gateway) (2 msgs)  
                    Internet->packet Gateway

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Packet-Radio@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Packet-Radio-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Packet-Radio Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/packet-radio".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 7 Feb 91 14:16:52 GMT  
From: mcsun!ukc!acorn!agodwin@uunet.uu.net (Adrian Godwin)  
Subject: 'To:' field anarchy!  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

In article <1991Feb6.190903.1295@axion.bt.co.uk> blloyd@zaphod.axion.bt.co.uk writes:

>Well, a fair few of us BBS writers read this newsgroup, so maybe this would  
>be a good place to work out something better. I've added an LG command  
>(List Group) to my software which lists all the TO 'groups' and the number  
>of messages in each group. You can also type LG group\_name (eg LG RAYNET)

This sounds good, but the main point I wanted to make was that there should be some encouragement whilst actually posting - so users are gently reminded that they're posting outside the currently accepted set of topics. I don't think educating users is sufficient - there will always be new users who don't know the netiquette, and don't RTFM.

Gentle prompting towards a more conveniently organised system seems much more likely to work, provided that such a system is seen as good by most users.

Aliases might be used to remap common TO errors into the more accepted set.

It seems wrong to treat one group name differently from others, but perhaps an entry to ALL should result in an additional prompt to try and obtain a more specific subject from the user - there's likely to be so many users posting to ALL that an automatic offer to create a group called that would soon be taken up, and no more warnings would be produced. (Yes, I know I argued differently previously - I'm just thinking it through :-))

I suspect that having a concept of a 'current group' as used by most other newsreading software means less typing to select a batch of related news items - but perhaps that's just my prejudice.

I certainly find the requirement to remember a whole list of 'interesting' article numbers, then typing them in 6 at a time fairly irritating - but then I'm used to a network terminal where it's often quicker to read every article, hitting the 'junk' key after reading a few lines, than selecting subjects from a list.

I imagine that the user information stored on current BBSs is quite small, and would be vastly increased by tracking the articles read in each group, rather than globally. Is this likely to be a problem ? Do packet BBSs have much larger user bases than telephone BBSs ?

I'm not especially interested in a religious argument about the merits of using TCP/IP for news distribution - though I would be interested to read a balanced summary of any previous discussions. It may well be that news will eventually be distributed between BBSs and TCP/IP users by another method, and fixed TO groups would certainly assist that. If you feel inclined to start that war, consider this discussion to be about user interfaces to newsreaders/posters, regardless of whether that interface runs locally or on the BBS.

--

-----

Adrian Godwin

(agodwin@acorn.co.uk)

-----  
Date: 7 Feb 91 21:59:57 GMT  
From: shelby!paulf%shasta.Stanford.EDU@uunet.uu.net (paulf)  
Subject: 'To:' field anarchy!  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

There is an easier solution to all of this. With the conversion of most minicomputing lines to RISC architectures (SUN, DEC, SGI et al), there are a ton of surplus unix boxes appearing on the market, at prices far less than the typical 386 box.

Has anybody written the equivalent of G protocol KISS code?

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | Without KILL files,  
->paulf@shasta.Stanford.EDU | life itself would be impossible.

-----  
Date: 7 Feb 91 16:45:29 GMT  
From: pa.dec.com!shlump.nac.dec.com!koning.enet.dec.com@decwrl.dec.com (Paul Koning)  
Subject: Has Part 97 changed THAT much? (was Re: PACKET->Internet Gateway)  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

|>  
|> My copy of Part 97 is in the ARRL "The FCC Rule Book". None of these  
|>paragraphs (a) exist or (b) say the same thing. Has Part 97 really changed  
|>that much since November 1, 1987?  
|>

It certainly has! Part 97 was completely rewritten last year. Throw out your ancient copy and get a new one...

paul

-----  
Date: 7 Feb 91 17:07:38 GMT  
From: idacrd!mac@princeton.edu (Robert McGwier)  
Subject: Has Part 97 changed THAT much? (was Re: PACKET->Internet Gateway)  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

-----  
Date: 7 Feb 91 21:39:41 GMT  
From: att!linac!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!rpi!clarkson!  
@ucbvax.Berkeley.EDU (Tadd,KA2DEW, ,3152621123)  
Subject: Internet->packet Gateway  
To: packet-radio@ucsd.edu

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
What if the guy originating the message IS a ham but is typing something  
that he/she doesn't expect to go over ham radio packet?  
Tadd - KA2DEW

[ KA2DEW @ KA2JXI.#NNY.NY.USA.NA	- Tadd Torborg	]
[ torbortc@clutx.clarkson.edu	- 26 Maple St - PO Box 330	]
[ NEDA (North East Digital Association) Editor	- Colton, NY 13625	]
[ Clarkson University	- 315-262-1123	]

-----  
Date: (null)  
From: (null)  
Yes Dana:

There was a rewrite in 1988, with some other changes made in 1990. The ARRL asked that the very paragraphs used in this citation be made more explicit and less vague and open to interpretation and the FCC rejected the request. The ARRL has tried to make changes that would help but many times their efforts have gone awry. The most egregious are the codification and sanctification of AX.25L2V2 in Part 97 after we were explicitly promised that this would NOT occur and the rewrite in 1988 that included more confusing language, and in some cases contradictory language on bits, bauds, spectral occupancy, and more. I do wish they would take the time to ask people with some expertise/interest to look things over and to comment in a timely fashion.

These opinions notwithstanding, I am supportive of a strong effort, if not by us, then by the FCC to clean up ALL@USA which is in a gray area in Part 97 AT BEST IMHO. The ARRL (the general manager in particular) will have a policy statement in the NEXT QST which attempts to address this problem and call for a solution. Too bad we had to have FCC action before our own folks got in behind the problem.

AMSAT-NA, a large use of packet networks for distribution of news, has taken an extremely conservative stance of late (the last several months) after we had one of our officers, W2RS, point out to us that new bulletins containing our telephone number, or announcing software availability, etc. was, at best, not in the spirit of those portions of Part 97 concerned with business communications. We told WEBER that they could NOT do their planned mission (having paid employees do experiments on their satellite) using amateur radio frequencies and more. If others don't take similar stands, and exercise similar restraint, then the FCC can AND SHOULD step in. It is my opinion that they have gone too far with this particular set of citations but there is NO ONE to blame but ourselves.

Bob N4HY

--

---

My opinions are my own no matter		Robert W. McGwier, N4HY
who I work for! ;-)		CCR, AMSAT, etc.

---

-----  
End of Packet-Radio Digest

\*\*\*\*\*